

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexasotra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.repto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/787,421	02/26/2004	Majed M. Hamawy	960296.99187	5432	
27114 7590 06/05/2008  OUARLES & BRADY LLP  EXAMINER				IINER	
411 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 2040			ROONEY, NO	ROONEY, NORA MAUREEN	
MILWAUKEE	E, WI 53202-4497 ART UNIT PAPER NU.				
			1644		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/05/2008	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail  $\,$  address(es):

pat-dept@quarles.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/787,421	HAMAWY, MAJED M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NORA M. ROONEY	1644	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

	Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
<u>AME</u>	NDMENTS
2 M	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the data of filing a brief will not be entered because

_	(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. 🔲	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) 🛛 will not be entered, or b) 🗌 will be entered and an explanation of
	how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
	Claim(s) allowed: NONE.
	Claim(s) objected to:
	Claim(s) rejected: 2.9 and 17.
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>14-16</u> .
<b>AFFII</b>	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a

showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the	attached Information	n Disclosure Statement(s	). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
13. Other:				

/Maher M. Haddad/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1644 Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The proposed amendments to claim 17 do not overcome the outstanding rejections under 112, first paragraph for reasons of record. Further, the amendments raise new issues as detection of a 5KDa protein has not previously been considered.

The recited claims encompass detection of SEQ ID NO:1 with anti-phosphotyrosine antibody and this method is not enabled for reasons of record. Further, the sample or homogenate thereof is contacted with a labelled antibody that is "capable of binding to the marker protein in the sample or to a fragment of the phosphorylated marker protein in the homogenate that is about 55kDa in size." However, that limitation is only referring to the specificity of the antibody, not to the actual contacting method step. The sample or homogenate is contacted and the extent to which the labelled antibody becomes bound to the marker protein or fragment is detected. Therefore, contrary to Applicant's assertion the claims are directed to all fragments of SEQ ID NO:1.

Applicant's assertion that the detection of other 55KDa proteins would not interfere with the results of the method because the amount of the other 55KDa proteins would be the same in both samples so the presence would be corrected for when determining the results is unpersuasive. There is no way to predict what factors would affect the presence or absence of other 55KDa proteins in the kidney samples. Other 55kDa proteins might be more or less phosphorylated during kidney transplant rejections and there is no way to predict the result.